PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

O E VC	e Paperwork Re	eduction Act of 1995	no person	s are required to respond to a c Application Number			unless it	displays a valid OMB control number.	
6,	11)			.,	10/671,				
TRANSMITTAL FORM			Filing Date		9/25/2003				
			First Named Inventor		Robert Parlee				
			Art Unit	3611	3611				
de de for all correspondence after initial filing)			Examiner Name	David T	David T. Beck				
Total Numb	er of Pages in	This Submission	9	Attorney Docket Number	parlee0	1.005		7)	
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)									
	Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached Amendment/Reply			Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition			After Allowance Communication to TC Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority Rei				Request for Refund re CD, Number of CD(s) Landscape Table on CD			Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): return postcard		
Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							ENT	,	
Firm Name Gordon E. Nelson, Patent Attorney, PC									
Signature Aulau C Welon Printed name									
. mico name	Gordo	n E. Nelson							
Date July 2		1, 2005 Reg. No. 3			30,09	30,093			
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on									
the date shown below: Signature Welche EU Welch University of the date shown below:									
Typed or printed name Gordon E. Nelson							Date	July 21, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (parlee01.005)

Applicant:

Robert Parlee

Paper No.:

Application No:

10/671,078

Group Art Unit: 3611

Filed:

9/25/03

Examiner: David T. Beck

FAX: 517-273-2942

Title: Techniques for making carbon fiber bicycle frames

Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to a non-final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Background

Applicant received a first Office action in the above application mailed 4/29/05. After a restriction requirement and election, claims 17 and 19-23 remained for examination. If claim 17 is found to be patentable, the restriction requirement will no longer include claim 18, which is dependent from claim 17. In the first Office action, Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,986,949, Trimble, Method of making composite bicycle frames, issued 1/22/91 (henceforth Examiner graciously granted Applicant a telephonic interview on "Trimble"). Wednesday, July 20 at 10:00. Applicant's attorney submitted an Argument to Examiner prior to the interview to aid Examiner in his preparation for the interview. In the interview, Examiner agreed that the claims as amended in the Argument were patentable over Trimble and pointed out that strictly speaking, tubes are included in Trimble's mold. Applicant's attorney thanks Examiner for the interview and for his conclusion that the claims as amended are patentable over Trimble. This response includes the claims as amended in the Argument and better states the differences between Applicant's techniques and those of Trimble.